REMARKS

Objections to the Drawings

The Drawings stand objected to for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner requests that *"if the user data is associated with an interactive node that has been executed the interactive node is re-executed"* be shown in the figures. Further, the Examiner requests that *"the processor is arranged to compensate executed activity nodes that follow in the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node"* be shown in the figures.

Applicants hereby submit proposed new figure 4, as well as consistent amendments to the specification to overcome these objections. In particular, proposed new figure 4 shows that *"if the user data is associated with an interactive node that has been executed the interactive node is re-executed"* (Boxes 402, 403, 404) and shows that *"the processor is arranged to compensate executed activity nodes that follow in the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node"* (Box 405).

Page 4 of the specification has been amended to describe briefly Fig. 4. Page 13 of the specification has been amended for clarity reasons. In particular, reference numbers related to the features shown in Fig. 4 have been introduced. The sentence *"If the received data differs the process executor 203 determines, for example, by comparison with data expected from other interactive nodes included within the process definition"*, unclear, has been clarified to *"If the received data differs the process executor 203 determines, for example, by comparison with data expected from other interactive nodes included within the process definition, if the agent data is associated with one of said other interactive nodes"*. This clarification is supported by the specification as filed, in particular page 3, lines 6-8.

Further, the sentence *"If the process executor 203 identifies that there is an out of sequence response the process executor 203 will compensate the activity nodes from the current activity node back to the repeated node"* has been clarified to recite *"If the process executor 203 identifies that there is an out of sequence response the process executor 203 will repeat (404) the node associated with the out of sequence response and will compensate (405) the activity*

nodes from the current activity node back to the repeated node". This amendment is supported by the specification as filed, in particular page 3, lines 6-8.

No new matter has been added. Applicants submit that new Fig. 4 is fully supported by the application as filed, and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to the drawings.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 stand objected to for misspelling the word "analyze". Claims 1 and 7 use the British English verb "analyse". MPEP 608.01 recites that the Examiner should not object to the specification and/or claims in patent applications merely because applicants are using British English Spelling. Claims 2 and 8 used incorrectly the noun "analyse", which has been amended to "analysis". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection as regards the word "analyse" in claims 1, 2, 7 and 8.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 stand rejected for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree.

<u>Claims 2 and 8</u>

As regards claims 2 and 8, the Examiner asserts that the sentence *"in response to the analyze, to initiate execution of the associated interactive node such that if the user data is associated with an interactive node that has been executed the interactive node is re-executed"* is not specifically found in the main body of the specification nor the drawings to enable one of ordinary skill in the art how *"the interactive node is re-executed"* in the system.

Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit that new Fig. 4, in particular boxes 402, 403, 404 as described in amended specification page 13, clearly support the above sentence and show that it is first determined that the *"user data"* is associated to *"data expected from other interactive nodes included within the process definition"*, and then that the interactive node associated to the user data is repeated or re-executed. If the interactive

node associated to the user data is the current interactive node, it stays in the interactive node.

Applicants further submit that once it has been determined that the interactive node associated to the user data must be re-executed, to re-execute said interactive node is a routine implementation that would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 2 and 8.

Claims 3 and 9

As regards claims 3 and 9, the Examiner asserts that the sentence *"compensate executed activity nodes that follow in the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node"* is not specifically found in the main body of the specification nor the drawings to enable one of ordinary skill in the art how *"the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node"*.

Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit that the specification, and in particular page 13, lines 18-20, directs to U.S. 5,870,545 which describes in detail how to compensate the activity nodes. Applicants further submit that the sentence *"the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node"* (recited in Box 405 of Fig. 4) is self-descriptive and would thus be clear for one of ordinary skill in the art. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 3 and 9.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,298,356 to Jawahar. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1

The Examiner asserts that "Jawahar teaches a computer apparatus for

implementing a workflow, the workflow being defined by a sequence of activity nodes that include a plurality of interactive nodes, the computer apparatus comprising a processor for arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence, wherein each interactive node is arranged to allow a user to input data for use in the execution of an activity node, the processor being arranged to analyse the user data to determine the interactive node in the sequence of activity nodes to which the data is associated", and directs the Applicants to col. 13, lines 10-28 and col. 16, lines 23-39 in Jawahar.

Applicants note that col. 13, lines 10-28 in Jawahar relate to an agent's computer wherein a frame 192 (Fig. 6A) represents the web page or other information currently being displayed to the customer, whereas col. 16, lines 23-39 in Jawahar relate to an access monitoring application (Figs. 7A, 7B) executed by the customer's (or user's) computer.

Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to clearly show whether "the computer apparatus for implementing a workflow" in Jawahar is the customer's computer or the agent's computer.

The user's computer in Jawahar is provided for accessing a web page or a web server containing one or more web pages (col. 14, lines 3-6). Even if one were to equate a webpage to an activity node, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to show where it is disclosed or suggested in Jawahar that the user's computer is provided for arranging and initiating the execution of activity nodes in accordance with a defined sequence, and more particularly that the user's computer comprises a *"processor for arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence"*, as recited in claim 1.

The Agent's computer in Jawahar is provided for displaying "the web page or other information currently being displayed to the customer" (frame 192 in fig. 6, col. 13, lines 6, 17), a text chat window, as well as various information (frames 194-200). Even if one were to equate displaying the web page and displaying the text chat window to initiating the execution of activity nodes, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to show where it is disclosed or suggested in Jawahar that the agent's computer is provided for arranging and initiating the execution of activity

nodes <u>in accordance with a defined sequence,</u> and more particularly that the agent's computer comprises a *"processor for arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence"*, as recited in claim 1.

At least in view of the above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Jawahar. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully request him to <u>clearly and specifically</u> point out where Jawahar discloses the above feature in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104(c)(2).

<u>Claim 7</u>

The above arguments can be used to show that the Examiner has failed to indicate where Jawahar discloses or suggests a method as recited in claim 7, and in particular comprising *"arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence"*, as recited in claim 7.

<u>Claims 2-6 and 8-9</u>

Claims 2-6 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1 and claims 8-9 depend directly or indirectly on claim 7. Applicants submit that claims 2-6 and 8-9 are patentable at least in view of their dependency on claims 1 or 7.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully urge the Examiner to pass this case to issue.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

_____
April 13, 2005
(Date of Transmission)

Corinda Humphrey
_____
(Name of Person Transmitting)

_____
(Signature)

_____
April 13, 2005
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Robert Popa
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 43,010
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile
rpopa@ladasparry.com

Attachments: Proposed new fig. 4.

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes proposed new figure 4.

Attachments: New sheet showing proposed new figure 4.